[Copy.]

Brooklyn, Feb. 26, 1836.

My dearly beloved Coadjutor:

Your very kind, instructive and acceptable letter of yesterday has just been received, for which I return you many thanks.

I perceive that bro. George has misapprehended me, respecting my contemplated review of Dr. Channing's book. Whether I shall give my criticisms to the public through the medium of the Liberator exclusively, or whether they will appear in ~~print~~ another form, I have not yet determined, for they remain to be written. At the longest, I shall make only a small pamphlet — not "a" book". Nor is it my design to taunt the Dr. on the ground of "plagiarism", because many of his thoughts are like our thoughts, and much of his language like our language. It would partake too much of the ridiculous, and savor too strongly of vanity or churlishness, for any abolition writer to plume himself upon having anticipated other writers in vindicating certain fundamental doctrines, appertaining to governments & the rights of man. Be assured, such a course is foreign both to my disposition and purpose. It is true, I mean to draw some parallel resemblances between Dr. Channing and certain "ultra" abolition writers, i.e. from their disquisitions — and for several reasons. First — To show that the Dr. has not made any new moral discoveries, which his admirers

would fain make a great doctor-of-divinity-worshipping public believe is the fact. Secondly — To show that the Dr. endorses those very principles which peculiarly characterize the abolitionists as a party, and for the dissemination of which they have been scorned, traduced, injured, and mobbed, as fanatics, madmen and traitors. Thirdly — To show that the Dr. has ~~lotted~~ acted disingenuously, and evinced a want of magnanimity, in not even slightly intimating that the abolitionists, with all their zeal and fanaticism, have uniformly and consistently maintained the great essential doctrines upon which human rights find an immovable basis. My object, in this last particular, is not so much to bring honor to any particular individuals, (though the rule is a good one — "Honor to whom honor is due,") as it is to vindicate the anti-slavery cause, as such, from the misrepresentations which have been cast upon it, even by some of the very men who are now lauding Dr. C's book to the skies. They who have been maligned ought to possess their souls in patience; but they certainly have a right modesty to acquit themselves if they can.

I think that you and I will agree as to the propriety and utility of such a presentation of the case.

Some other parallelisms will be drawn, which will be quite as afflicting to the Dr. & his admirers. These will show that his book abounds with inconsistencies, and neutralizes every useful truth contained in it. Abolitionists, in my opinion, have been hasty and unwise in praising the book, and taking special pains to circulate it. You will probably see in the Liberator of to-morrow, twenty-four reasons why I think they ought not to laud or commend the ~~book~~ work. The graphic picture which you have painted in your noble and disinterested speech in Boston, (a speech which ought to have been spoken in your behalf, not mine, for you are a much older and better soldier, and without your early co-operation, the anti-slavery cause would have dragged heavily,) — I say, that picture of the effect produced upon an individual, "remotely connected with slave-holding", in reading Dr. C's book through, shows plainly the inefficacy, nay, the deleterious tendency of such a give-and-take production. Your other objection is a vital one — "Dr. C.'s separates the sinner from his sin!" This is a radical defect; and a book which is radically defective, will never aid in reforming a radically corrupt nation.

There is one individual whom Dr. C. deigns to quote approvingly — but he is not an abolitionist — viz. Pres. Wayland.

I cannot think that Dr. C. is ignorant of the writings of the abolitionists. He has long been a subscriber &

to the Liberator, and has been presented with many other anti-slavery publications. The Emancipator, as the official organ of the national society, I presume he has carefully perused; and there is the strongest probable evidence, that your essays upon "Human Rights" were before him when he wrote his chapter on the same subject. I shall have occasion to allude to your essays in my review. I have read them all, carefully, with delight and profit.

Is it said by some of our numbers, "It is true, Dr. C. uses us rather ungenerously — but then, his opposing us will only cause his book to obtain a greater circulation, and to be read more candidly?"? I answer — the cause and the advocates of the cause are closely identified. Separate them, and the cause at once encounters defeat. We deceive ourselves, if we imagine that hostility to the abolitionists is no evidence of hostility to emancipation. George Thompson would never have been driven from this country, foreigner as he was, — if he had not branded slavery as sin, and held up the duty of immediate repentance. Why is J. G. Birney in such peril, even in Ohio? Or why were you tracked to Brooklyn by the blood-hounds in New York city? The mobocrats scarcely know a man of us personally; and aside from the cause that we espouse, they find no fault with us. Now Dr. C. brings two grievous

(because slanderous) accusations against the whole body of abolitionists — to wit, that they are fanatics, and that something has probably been lost to the cause of human liberty by their efforts!! We may complacently smile at such accusations: but the reputation of Dr. C. gives them an influence disastrous to our cause — yea, they are a two-edged sword, wounding us and our cause by the same blow. It was the preaching of the gospel alone, that made Peter & Paul, and Silas and Stephen, "pestilent fellows", "stirrers up of sedition", &c. It appears to me that Dr. C's book has no just claim upon us as to a peculiarly tender treatment: nay, it ought to be reviewed sharply, not acrimoniously, and with all fidelity. I wish I could persuade you to undertake this review, because I think it would be more skilfully done; and if you will promise to write it, I will desist.

What say you my dear friend? Were my late strictures upon Gerrit Smith merited or not? His letter to Gurley was not, I think, magnanimous. He seems to be wholly unwilling to allow, that he himself has erred in his views or principles at any time, but is liberal in rebuking both the Anti-Slavery and the Colonization Societies.

My copy of Wayland's Elements, (first edition) I have left in Boston. I meant to have noticed the work ere this. The part to which you allude I had marked for review.

Another edition of the work has been published, "abridged, and adapted to the use of schools and academies," a copy of which is before me. The work is almost entirely re-written, and, as a whole, is of some value. On the subject of slavery, he is corrupt and oppressive. "If", he says, "the slave be able to take care of himself, [the master is to be judge & jury, you will observe] the master will either immediately manumit him, — or, — by allowing him such wages as are just, enable him, in process of time, to liberate himself"!! that is, will make him pay roundly for an inalienable right!

In his chapter on Benevolence, he is equally inconsistent. Speaking of injuries received, he says — "Our blessed Saviour spent his life in doing good & his bitterest enemies, unmoved by the most atrocious and most malignant injustice. So we are commanded to bless those that curse us, &c. God has made it the condition of the pardon of our offences." Yet he immediately adds — "If a man break into my house, it does not follow, that I should not take proper means to have him put in prison"!!

Go to Utica, by all means. True you are wanted very much in Connecticut, at this crisis, and perhaps you can so arrange matters as to labor here till the May meeting. At all events go to Utica. I would rather see you in charge of an abolition paper, or any other moral reform paper, than any other

man in the range of my acquaintance, You may do much, I know, as a correspondent of the Emancipator, but you ought never to vacate the editorial chair as long as you have strength to fill it. Write one again soon.

Yours, affectionately, Wm. Lloyd Garrison.

(Addressed)

William Goodell,

Providence,

R. I.